



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,176	02/09/2004	Shaun T. Mesher	355-8	6755
20212	7590	10/08/2009	EXAMINER	
Lambert Intellectual Property Law			METZMAIER, DANIEL S	
Suite 200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
10328 - 81 Avenue			1796	
Edmonton, AB T6E 1X2				
CANADA				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/08/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tony@lambertlaw.ca
t9x@shaw.ca

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/773,176	Applicant(s) MESHER ET AL.
	Examiner Daniel S. Metzmaier	Art Unit 1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,10,14,16,17 and 30-44 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 14,16 and 17 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,10 and 30-44 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 10, 14, 16-17, and 30-44 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04 August 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 37, 39 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The examiner was unable to find and applicants failed to point out where in the original specification the subject matter of claims 37, 39 and 42 may be found. More specifically, claim 37 sets forth an open ended range that is not found in the original specification.

Claim 39 sets forth concentrations that do not correspond to the disclosed or exemplified compositions.

Claim 42 is a negative limitation that finds no basis in the original specification.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1, 10 and 30-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The last component of the claim 1 has an improper alternative grouping and the use of "and" in the penultimate line should be changed to "or". See MPEP 2173.05(h).

Furthermore, reference throughout the dependent claims to "the solvent" is confusing since the composition is made up of multiple solvents and acid.

The use of "the solvent comprising" is further confusing since said component set forth in claim 1 uses closed language while the dependent claims employ open language. Applicants' intended scope is unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 & Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. Claim 44 provides for the use of the composition of claim 1, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim 44 has not been rejected over the art because it is an improper claim. If amended, claim 44 may be withdrawn as a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 10, 30-41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkins, US 4,737,296.

Watkins (column 7, lines 33-36; column 8, lines 6-10, 26-32, 51-52, 66 to column 9, line 1; column 9, lines 45) discloses the formation of acid-containing foams for the purpose of cleaning scale out of conduits. Watkins (column 7, line 36) clearly contemplates mixtures of solvents.

Watkins (column 8, lines 6 et seq) clearly contemplates alcohols, esters and ketones as claimed.

Watkins differs from the claims in the use of a particular combination of solvents and the concentrations thereof.

Watkins (column 7, lines 33-36; column 8, lines 6-10, 26-32, 51-52, 66 to column 9, line 1) contemplates mixtures of solvents including those instantly claimed. Watkins (example 16) discloses the use of MEK at about 22 vol% and about 74 vol% acid. The vol% is referenced for simplicity and the wt% of the materials would not vary dramatically therefrom since the materials would have been expected to have specific gravities of about 1.

It is generally *prima facie* obvious to use in combination two or more ingredients that have previously been used separately for the same purpose in order to form a third composition useful for that same purpose. In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980); In re Pinten, 459 F.2d 1053, 173 USPQ 801 (CCPA 1972); In re Susi, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971); In re Crockett, 279 F.2d 274, 126 USPQ 186 (CCPA 1960). As stated in Kerkhoven and Crockett, the idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art. In the instant case, the ester, ether, and alcohol solvents are all taught for the same function as a mutual solvent of the oil and water. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to employ the mixtures in an acid-containing composition for the advantage of matching the solvent system to the system, e.g., sludge and scale, being treated.

The specification does not provide a showing of criticality of the particular solvents and each is specifically recited in the Watkins reference.

Since Watkins (column 8, lines 6 et seq) clearly contemplates the instantly claimed alcohols, esters and ketones in various concentrations and the properties of said solvents are well known, it is reasonable and would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled artisan to employ the solvents in mixtures at varied concentrations in the absence of unobvious and/or criticality of the particular concentrations.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 14 and 16-17 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112 set forth in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 04 August 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11. Applicants (pages 6 and 7) assert the claimed "mutual solvent system" distinguish the claims from the Watkins reference since the Watkins reference desires emulsification properties. This has not been deemed persuasive.

Applicants claims do not exclude the materials of the Watkins reference and applicants have the burden of showing the further materials not explicitly set forth in the claims would materially effect applicants' invention. Applicants have not met their burden.

Furthermore, applicants do not exclude and would be interpreted as clearly contemplating materials that would form colloidal solutions by the characterization in paragraph [0001] of the **specification** that **teaches** a "mutual solvent of oil and water" and:

"A challenge in the art of acidizing wells is to provide a solvent system with a mutual solvent that is effective in cleaning wells and production equipment, while being economical and environmentally friendly."

Nowhere in the instant application is "mutual solvent system comprising a solution" taught or defined as a single phase solution.

12. Applicants (pages 6 to 9) remaining arguments have been previously been addressed.

Applicants' claims do not exclude emulsifiers, foaming agents, or colloidal solutions. Furthermore, (paragraph 13); "Immaterial modifications may be made to the invention described here, without departing from the invention as defined by the claims."

Clearly colloidal solutions have not been distinguished by the amendments to the claims and clearly applicants contemplate further ingredients, such as emulsifiers.

This has furthermore not been deemed persuasive since it is unclear what results applicants are relying that is asserted as unexpected since the combination of solvents have not been shown to be above the additive effect of the components, which are each taught as solvents.

13. Applicants' amendments are not deemed to distinguish the rejection, which has been maintained for the reasons as set forth above and those in the Office action
Mailed 04 March 2009.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel S. Metzmaier whose telephone number is (571) 272-1089. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David W. Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**/Daniel S. Metzmaier/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796**

DSM